



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/736,237	12/15/2003	Antonino Calabro	02CT39253415	3158	
27975 7590 03/21/2007 ALLEN, DYER, DOPPELT, MILBRATH & GILCHRIST P.A. 1401 CITRUS CENTER 255 SOUTH ORANGE AVENUE			EXAMINER		
			COUGHLAN, PETER D		
P.O. BOX 3791 ORLANDO, FL 32802-3791		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
ORDINIDO, I	2 32002 3771		2129		
			<u></u>		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/21/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s) ·
10/736,237	CALABRO ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
Peter Coughlan	2129

Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Peter Coughlan	2129					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence ado	iress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>05 March 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AI	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	•				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or o this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notation (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comp following time periods:	n the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in liance with 37 CFR 1.114. The rep	f Appeal. To avoid al ffidavit, or other evid compliance with 37 (ence, which CFR 41.31; or				
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(fextensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o . ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE F .).	f the final rejection. IRST REPLY WAS FILE	D WITHIN TWO				
extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month partned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension of (2)	on fee under 37) as set forth in (b)				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com	pliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	e filed within two mor	nths of the date				
of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e	extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal	of the appeal.				
Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must	be filed within the time period set to	orth in 37 CFR 41.37	(a).				
AMENDMENTS	Luk minuka kha daka af filimma a beia	f will not be entered	haaayaa				
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(a) ⊠ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below), (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);							
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be		educing or simplifying	g the issues for				
appeal; and/or	,,						
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a		ejected claims.					
NOTE: They raise the new issue of a database.	(See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.	The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).						
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a	allowable if submitted in a separate	e, timely filed amendr	ment canceling				
the non-allowable claim(s). 7. Solution Transport (Section 1) The proposed amendment(s): a)	will not be entered, or b) u	vill be entered and an	explanation of				
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.							
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>6-23</u> .							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>0-23</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b	out before or on the date of filing a	Notice of Appeal will	<u>not</u> be entered				
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good at and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	nd sufficient reasons why the affida	vit or other evidence	is necessary				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessa	overcome all rejections under appe	eal and/or appellant fo	ails to provide a 🦠				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation							
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	ut days NOT place the emplication	in condition for allow	anno hocalico:				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered b See Continuation Sheet.			ance pecause.				
2. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).							
13. 🔲 Other:							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In section II applicant claims the claims state a useful, concrete and tangible result. Additionally the applicant states this can be used for cryptography as stated in 0002. Reviewing the claims, the factoring of a number is not a practical application. The word 'cryptography' is not mentioned within the specification. In 0002 the phrase 'search of minima' is mentioned which is not associated with cryptography. The Examiner notes the applicant's argument but is not persuaded.

In section III p10, lines 8 and 22, both Wikipedia and mathworld are not cited references within the MPEP.

On page 10 lines 9 through 16 the Examiner asked how the 'int' function works. Does it round up, round down or truncate? Applicant claims 0084 has the answer but only repeats the claim language. The Examiner notes the applicant's argument but is not persuaded.

On page 9 line 27 through p10 line 8, the Examiner is persuaded by the applicant argument and withdraws the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection concerning claims 6, 9, 11, 16.

In section IV page 10, line23 through page 13 line 24, not a specific portion of a specified claim is mentioned. The Examiner has to guess what the applicant is trying to argue against.

On page 11, lines 6-11 the applicant states that Ulyanov is not relevant to the invention due to the fact different algorithms are used. The Examiner disagrees, both algorithms are based upon quantum mechanics and taking advantage of their unique properties, therefore they are relevant.

Page 12 line starts with 'As for the dependent claims...' Does this mean all lines prior to this relate to the independent claims? If so p11 line 21 states reference 0296. But in independent claims 6 and 11 this paragraph is not used.

Page 12, lines 7-11 applicant states that Ulyanov does not teach how to calculate indices on non-null components. In 0574 the creation of an initial position can be viewed as indices no non-null components.

Page 12 lines 20-25 applicant states equating a memory buffer is different from a register. Examiner disagrees due to the fact is known within the art a memory buffer is a register.